LARYSA KOMPANTSEVA

Ukrainos saugumo tarnybos Nacionalinė akademija, Ukraina
National Academy of the Security Service of Ukraine, Ukraine

ANTROPOCENTRIZMO FILOSOFIJA SOCIALINIUOSE TINKLUOSE: BERNARDO LONERGANO (KANADA) IR UKRAINOS MOKYKLOS „ŠIRDIES FILOSOFIJA" IDĖJŲ EKSTRAPOLIACIJA

The Philosophy of Anthropocentrism in Organization of Social Networks: Extrapolation of Ideas of Bernard Lonergan (Canada) and The Ukrainian School of "Philosophy of Heart"

SUMMARY

The paper analyses the anthropocentrism of social networks through the concepts of Bernard Lonergan, a Canadian Catholic theologian and philosopher, and the Ukrainian orthodox school of the "philosophy of heart": both have similar ideas despite the lapse of time and differences in cultural and national traditions. The anthropocentric parameters of social networks organization prove the concepts of Lonergan and the "philosophy of heart". The analysis of social networks through the prism of the concepts of Bernard Lonergan and the Ukrainian orthodox school of the "philosophy of heart" show their anthropological orientation and affinity in solving such issues as: dialogism as the basis of development of a person, society, and science; tolerance as respect for the "difference" of others; "question" as an attribute of spirituality; love as the moral basis of anthropologization of God; person as a microcosm. The extrapolation of the ideas of B. Lonergan and the school of the "philosophy of heart" in the sphere of discourse-analysis of social networks allows one to conclude to their systemic anthropocentric organization and to wide possibilities of a religious interpretation of discourses of social networks.

SANTRAUKA

Straipsnyje analizuojamas per socialinius tinklus reiškiamas antropocentrizmas, kuris remiasi Kanados katalikų teologo ir filosofo Bernardo Lonergano ir Ukrainos „Širdies filosofijos" stačiatikių mokyklos sampratų aiškinimu. B. Lonerganas ir Ukrainos „Širdies filosofijos" stačiatikių mokykla priklauso skirtingoms kultūroms ir tradicijoms, vis dėlto jų reiškiamos idėjos yra stulbinamai panašios. Bendras B. Lonergano ir „Širdies filosofijos" mokyklos antropocentrizmo vektorius rodo esant panašų Kanados ir Ukrainos filosofinių minčių plėtojimosi kelią. Straipsnyje nagrinėjami antropocentriniai socialinių tinklų parametrai, apimantys tokias temas: dialogizmas kaip asmens, visuomenės ir mokslo raidos pagrindas; tolerancija kaip pakanta kitų „skirtingumui"; „klausimas" kaip dvasingumo išraiška; meilė kaip moralinis Dievo antropologizavimo pagrindas; asmuo kaip mikrokosmas. B. Lonergano ir „širdies filosofijos" idėjų ekstrapoliacija rodo sisteminę antropocentrinę socialinių tinklų organizaciją ir religinių filosofijų raidą aiškinant socialinių diskursų galimybes socialiniuose tinkluose.

INTRODUCTION

Social networks are a marker of the 21st century. Liberalization of communications (Habermas 1970), "design of social realities" (Iorgensen, Fillips 2004: 35), the appeal to the truths of cultural identity (Ionas 2004: 218) are the communicative events / discursive practices of social networks that require philosophical interpretation, which has been partly done by researchers from different countries including Ukraine (Kompantseva 2006; Korolyov 2020; Snytko 2020) and Lithuania (Darginavičienė 2018; Ignotaitė 2018; Stančienė 2011). In this research, anthropocentrism is examined through the lens of the concepts of Bernard Lonergan, a Canadian catholic theologist, and the Ukrainian orthodox school of the "philosophy of heart"; both, despite the lapse of time and differences in cultural and national traditions, have similar ideas: the moral basis of formation of personality and society; personality as microcosm; perception of religion and the world through the lens of love; interpretation of the world through text interpretation. Thus, philosophical concepts of Bernard Lonergan and of the "philosophy of heart", which help to reveal a common anthropocentric vector of development of the Canadian and Ukrainian philosophical idea, are the study object of this article. Anthropological parameters of social networks organization proving the expressions of concepts of Bernard Lonergan and the "philosophy of heart" make up the subject of research. The aim is to show the consistency of social networks organization from the perspective of conceptual frameworks of Bernard Lonergan and the "philosophy of heart".

BERNARD LONERGAN AND THE UKRAINIAN SCHOOL OF THE "PHILOSOPHY OF HEART": HISTORICAL AND PHILOSOPHICO-RELIGIOUS PARALLELS

Bernard J.F. Lonergan (1904–1984) was a priest, a professor of catholic theology, an Associate Member of The British Academy. He is the author of the *genera-*

lized empirical method (GEM) which lays the foundations for the interaction between religion and science based on cognitive theory ("What do I do when I know?"), epistemology ("Why do we engage in cognition?"), metaphysics ("What do I know when I do this?"), methodology ("So, what should we do?"). According to B. Lonergan, "Method offers not rules to be followed blindly, but a framework for creativity" (Lonergan 1979: XI).

B. Lonergan considers the theory of cognition as the main discipline of cognition (Lonergan 1941: XV), relevant to the "anthropological twist" of modern Catholicism suggesting that "dogmatic theology" should become "theological anthropology". The transcendental essence of love, faith and dialogue is understood by B. Lonergan through the phenomenon of insight that allows a person to reach a certain level of knowledge, evaluate their choices and make decisions (Lonergan 1963).

The history of Ukrainian philosophy begins much later than the European one, mainly due to geopolitical reasons.

> Ukrainian cultural life has not always been very sharply and brightly self-sustained and separate, which makes it hard to characterize Ukrainian philosophical thought … Ukrainian history declines at some point to the level of "regional history" (Russian, partly Polish) … Even the language cannot be a definite measure here, because very few Ukrainian thinkers wrote in the Ukrainian language. However, national peculiarities were manifested in their thoughts, as it always happens, quite spontaneously, "naturally" (Chyzhevskyi 1992).

Separation of the "philosophy of heart" was one of the first steps towards the formation of Ukrainian philosophical traditions, implemented in emotional forms of "cordocentrism". The concept *HEART*, the spiritual code of the Ukrainian culture, contains a wide range of semantic components – emotionality (*сердечно – heartily*); pity (*сердега–poor fellow*), anger (*сердитися* – to get angry), mercy (*милосердний* – merciful). The coding nature of the concept *HEART* is confirmed by the etymological history of its verbalizer: Old Russian *сердьце* – proto-Slavic *sьrdьce, sьrdьko* – IndoEuropean *kerdis* – heart, core (since ancient times, the heart was associated with the center). Related with it are: Lith. *širdis,* Gk. *kardia*, Latv. *sirds*, O. Prus. *seyr*, Arm. *sirt*, Goth. *hairto,* Ger. *herz*, Eng. *heart* (Dictionary of the Old Ukrainian Language of the XIV–XV Centuries 1978).

The symbol of heart is interpreted by the founders of the "philosophy of heart" as follows: 1) heart is the guard and bearer of human bodily forces; 2) the repository of a person's spiritual life; 3) the source of cognitive activity; 4) the emotional and willpower center; 5) the core of a person's moral life (Yurkevych 1990b).

The school of the "philosophy of heart" was founded by D. Chyzhevskyi (Chyzhevskyi 1992), who systematized the historical-philosophical process in Ukraine having analyzed the creative legacy of H. Skovoroda, V. Zolotnytskyi, P. Sokhatskyi, P. Yurkevych, M. Hohol, representatives of Cyril and Methodius school (P. Kulish, T. Shevchenko, M. Hulak and other), philosophers of the 2nd half of the 19th century (O. Potebnia, V. Lesevych, A. Spir and other).In the 20th century, S. Krymskyi was one of the most famous representatives of the "philosophy of heart".

ANTHROPOCENTRISM AS A KEY VECTOR OF THE THEOLOGICAL CONCEPT OF BERNARD LONERGAN AND THE SCHOOL OF THE "PHILOSOPHY OF HEART"

Let's outline the general provisions of the concepts of B. Lonergan and the "philosophy of heart" relevant to the study of anthropocentric foundations of social networks.

Dialogism as the basis for development of a person, society, and science

B. Lonergan justified the idea of dialogue between religion and science, which is developing in the direction from human nature to human history; from simple principles to the transcendental method; from dogmatism to tolerance, dialogue and anthropocentrism. There are three types of relations between communication and theology: interdisciplinary relations with art, language, literature, natural and human sciences, and other religions; appeal to hearts and minds of people of all cultures and classes; full and proper use of multiple media at any time anywhere (Lonergan 1979: 132–133).The philosopher believed that pluralism and openness of polemics are the conditions for development of philosophical knowledge because "main issue is in the heart and not the head ..." (Lonergan 2005b: 85–86).

The school of the "philosophy of heart" examines dialogue as philosophical creativity which "does not remain static but proceeds to processing other people's acquired thoughts" (Chyzhevskyi 1992). O. Potebnia defined language as an instrument of thought, and the

dialogue of philosophy, religion and culture as the basis for development of a nation's view of the world. "…our word influences the others. It establishes a connection between reserved individuals not by means of equating their contents, but, so to say, organizing them harmoniously" (Potebnia 1976: 307).

Tolerance as respect for the "difference" of others

According to B. Lonergan, tolerance should change dogma; without it, neither religion nor science and society have a chance to develop further. The philosopher sought to develop the program of Pope Leo XIII – "Augment and complete the old with the new" (Vetera novis augere et perficere).

> So contemporary Catholic theology has to be not only Catholic but also ecumenist. Its concern must reach not only Christians but also non-Christians and atheists. It has to learn to draw not only on modern philosophies but also on the relatively new sciences of religion, psychology, sociology, and the new techniques of communication arts (Lonergan 1974: 62–63).

The school of the "philosophy of heart" also interpreted tolerance through the prism of pluralism. For example, in the dialogues of H. Skovoroda (Skovoroda 1994) the ideal of unequal equality is praised as respect for each person's choice to have their own way of life ("Each town should have its own character and rights"). P. Yurkevych defined

the conditions of tolerant coexistence as such: a person as a moral individual has no reason to feud with others; in the context of conflict, moral demands of justice must be guiding (Yurkevych 1990b).

S. Krymskyi generalized understanding of tolerance, identifying a personality as a unity of three components – "conscious individuality as selfness, persona as the subject of responsibility, and the inner world of man in his moral self-directedness" (Krymskyi 2003: 37). This unity provides for direct inclusion of individuals into common space of a semantic community of people, forms existence as tolerant coexistence.

"Question" as an attribute of spirituality

Lonergan refers reflections on God and the desire of mankind "to see God" to the key issues of faith, noting that all adventures are reduced to two questions: *an sit* and *quid sit* (*Does He exist? What is He?*) (Lonergan 1988: 81–82).For a person, the important question is *why*, and it is possible to answer it only with the transcendental approach (Lonergan 1988: 83).

D. Chyzhevskyi defines the philosophical problem of anthropological existence of individual, living and reasonable beings as a comprehensive one. "Only by learning the concept of the good, we become aware, at least, that "what *may be* (the idea) evolves into what *exists* (reality) through what it *should be* ($\tau\dot{o}\ \dot{\alpha}\gamma\alpha\theta\acute{o}\nu$)" (Chyzhevskyi 1992).

I. Shad considered "what" and "why" "is", or "what should be done" and "based on what" to be the most important issues for the philosophy, since "actual philosophy is not just learning of pheno-mena, but also knowledge of the potentials of phenomena (Chyzhevskyi 1992).

S. Krymskyi, above all, is attracted by the question of personification, and he considered the "metaphysical" and "gnoseological cycle" as the key questions for the "philosophy of heart". To the first cycle belong the following: "What is "I"?, "What is "Not I"(the world or another living person)?; and "What is "Super I" (absolute, ideal, God)? The second cycle includes: "What can I know?", "What can I expect?", and "What can I do?" (Krymskyi 2003: 34).

Love as the moral basis of the anthropological nature of God

B. Lonergan defines love as the basis of Christianity because it guides man through self-knowledge to the good.

> The pure desire to know can set up the good of order, and it can understand it, it can even understand suffering to a certain extent, but the eros of mind, that pure desire to know, sets up exigencies that are beyond our capacity for fulfilment in our present state. We understand that in terms of the doctrine of original sin. But the grace of God is both a remedy for the moral impotence we suffer as a result of original sin and also much more than that. It is correction of the disintegrating and disruptive tendencies of human society and of individual living, but it also introduces that gratuitous self-donation of God, his initiative in loving us in the full sense, where love means something like quasi identification – the love of God in that sense of self-donation, like entering into the married state, living together, sharing one's life with another, and the quasi identification that that involves (Lonergan 2000: 380).

According to B. Lonergan, God gives all people His love regardless of religious affiliation. Specific to Christians is the manifestation of divine love in the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ (Lonergan 2005a: 170).

> And in the fact that God became man as our savior, there is that same manifestation of love, of God's love for mankind in the full sense of loving – a self-giving, to which we respond with a self-giving – that there is in charity something away beyond any ethical structure that can be based upon the pure desire to know (Lonergan 2000: 377).

The idea of love is also essential for the school of the "philosophy of heart". H. Skovoroda observed that man's love for God is the love for oneself, too. Yurkevych determined that moral demands of justice and love lead to the establishment of peace, common friendliness and brotherhood among people. The true meaning of an old greeting "Peace be unto you!" is in this.

Anthropological nature of God was specific both for representatives of Cyril and Methodius school and for Lonergan. For example, in the works of Shevchenko "God is actually a *man*, only an *extraordinary one* ... In a sense, Christ was a perfect, flawless man" (Chyzhevskyi 1992).

Person as a microcosm

B. Lonergan and representatives of the school the "philosophy of heart" raise the problem of personal self-identification, the linguistic markers of which are the words containing the morphemes *Self* and *само*.

The desire for intimacy of thinking is reflected in the history of languages. According to the Oxford Dictionary (Oxford English Dictionary Online 2019), in Old English there were only 13 words with the prefix *Self*, and half of them meant objective attitude. The dictionary of the Old Ukrainian language also records just 10 words with the segment *само* during XIV–XV centuries (Dictionary of the Old Ukrainian Language of the XIV–XV Centuries. 1978: 318); the Etymological Dictionary of the Ukrainian language adds two more meanings – "loneliness" and "similarity" (Dictionary of the Old Ukrainian Language of the XIV–XV Centuries. 1978: 171).

In B. Lonergan's works, all the notions containing the morpheme *Self* are classified as significant. Personality is studied by the philosopher comprehensively in the aspect of the problems of *self-transcendence, self-knowledge, self-appropriation, self-affirmation, self-consciousness, self-contradiction, self-development, self-donation, self-involvement, self-manifestation, self-presence, self-giving*. B. Lonergan determines the following as essential for personality formation: the ability for *self-transcendence* as self-control and self-improvement (Lonergan 2005a: 35); striving for *self-affirmation* (to reach it, "*a person needs to reflect, define, think, assume, weigh*") (Lonergan 2000: 133); and the readiness for *self-donation*.

The Ukrainian concept *HEART* is synonymous to the concept *Self* in B. Lonergan's philosophy, which has an ethnopsychological substantiation.

Emotionalism is manifested in a high-assessing sense of life. Feelings, emotions are even understood as ways of cognition (Hohol, Yurkevych).

The "philosophy of heart" (Yurkevych) is characteristic of Ukrainian thought. … in a person's spiritual life, deeper than conscious mental experiences, "heart" serves as its basis – the deepest in a person, the "abyss" which generates and determines the "surface" of our state of mind (Skovoroda, Hohol, Yurkevych, Kulish). This is connected with the recognition of the fact, that man is a small world, "microcosm", as everything that exists in the whole world lies in the "depth of the heart", the abyss (Skovoroda, Hohol). Undoubtedly, the characteristic feature of the psychological character of famous Ukrainians is their disposition for spiritual seclusiveness, which Hohol called "spiritual monastery" (Skovoroda, Hohol, Maksymovych, Kulish). This spiritual seclusiveness is the recognition for each person's rights to have their own, individual ethical way, what we might call "pluralistic ethics" (Skovoroda, Hohol) (Chyzhevskyi 1992).

The idea of self-knowledge as knowledge of God and knowledge of the world is archetypal for Ukrainian philosophy (Skovoroda 1994), as well as recognition of oneself (Yurkevych 1990a) and the meaning of life (Krymskyi 2003: 10) in the fellow-being.

THE PHILOSOPHY OF SOCIAL NETWORKS THROUGH THE PRISM OF THE CONCEPTS OF BERNARD LONERGAN AND THE SCHOOL OF THE "PHILOSOPHY OF HEART"

The concept of social networks entered Internet communications from B. Wellman's works; he defined the concept of community through the concept of interpersonal relationships, providing for social interaction, support, information, a sense of group membership and social identity (Wellman 2001). B. Wellman's interpretation has been modified in the term "virtual communities" proposed by H. Rheingold in the book "Virtual Community" (Rheingold 2000). Virtual communities are, in fact, a projection of social networks in the cyberspace; their aim is to establish a global dialogue to realize various social needs.

The philosophy of *dialogism* of social networks provides for creation of the "peer circle", so-called "echo-cameras", in which people with similar interests independently group in communities in order to be heard, to share information and help each other (such as the project "Advocacy, Protection and Legal Assistance to the Internally Displaced Population of Ukraine"); to create a shared experience (for example, a group on Facebook aiming to establish historical truth – HISTORIANS.IN.UA); to develop personal abilities and opportunities etc.

At the same time, dialogism of social networks has a downside – it creates the ground for different types of manipulation of visitors' ideas. For example, in 2017, Facebook analysts draw conclusions that social media platforms are a new tool for information operations, as for the first time in history, leaders and thinkers can reach a global audience; each communicant is a potential amplifier of information operations; thoughts are easily polarized – an individual accepts a socially defined truth, and then promotes it (Weedon, Nuland 2017).

The parameter of *tolerance* has several aspects of actualization in network communications. Firstly, it is a convergent organization of social networks (from Lat. *convergo – 'draw together'*) – a comprehensive process of communication and interaction, carried out in several dimensions:1) networks, 2) terminals; 3) services; 4) markets; 5) genres and forms; 6) regulation (Fagerjord, Storsul 2007); 7) ways to display, edit and distribute information; 8) code switching and code mixing; 9) monologue, dialogue and polylogue, etc.

Tolerant coexistence of various communities in the space-time continuum results in such convergence at the level of countries and continents, and in the creation of a unified communicative system recognizing difference of other people.

Secondly, one of the most important tolerant principles of social networks research is the *transparadigmatic nature* – coexistence of several scientific paradigms, which predetermines methodological pluralism of research, activity at the crossroads of sciences, application of methods and comparison of results of two or more scientific knowledge areas.

Based on the following parameters, the transparadigmatic approach allows to *find answers* about the development of social networks discourse: (1) formation of bi-directional content, combination of a manufacturer and a content consumer roles by network visitors; (2) exponential dissemination of content; (3) credibility of information obtained through the network; (4) the ability to create international teams of like-minded people to develop content jointly; (5) lack of place and time reference.

Virtual reality of social networks is in tune with the psychological and socionormative canon of man as a microcosm of the postmodern era, which provides for the possibility of play and construction of the plural I. When studying personality on social networks, we should take into account the typological, universal, semiotic and anthropologically significant for all cultures definition of person through language, as well as the peculiarities of communications in social networks, namely: limited written communication channel; language behavior is the most important characteristic of a person in virtual communication; social differences are determined by the nature of language units.

It is typical for the modern Ukrainian tradition to create virtual personalities, enjoying the trust of the public in their coverage of socio-political events. For example, a TV journalist Roman Vintoniv has created a virtual comedy character named Michael Shchur (Rat) (Toronto TV), who has 338 thousand subscribers (January 2020). Michael Shchur has a detailed biography – a correspondent of the Toronto TV Channel (a YouTube project); a member of the Ukrainian diaspora in Canada, seconded to Ukraine before the parliamentary elections of 2012 to interview local politicians. This character tells about serious and even tragic events with irony and humor, forms a "peer circle" from visitors of the resource (*I am writing for you, Let's think together*).

Anthropologization of social media communications has a psychological basis which lies in anthropological orienta-

tion of gadgets. B. Fogg put forward a new scientific direction – CAPTOLOGY (Computers as Persuasive Tool). According to him, gadgets take on the role of an interlocutor in the context of lack of interpersonal communications and trust (Fogg 1997: 227), because people credit gadgets with personality qualities: "A computer technology inherits exogenous intent when one person provides another person with a computer technology in an attempt to change that person's attitudes or behaviors" (Fogg 1997: 226).

In this way, gadgets begin to play a social role employed in communications

of religious institutions, in which the metaphor of *love as anthropologization of God* is embodied. Active communications of priests in social networks started after Pope Benedict XVI made a message for the 45th World Communications day. The Pope urged Christians to preach the gospel in social networks, as changes in the communication sphere "create a new way of perception and thinking, with previously unknown opportunities to establish relationships and build communities" (Message of His Holiness Pope Benedict XVI for the 45th World Communications day, 2011).

CONCLUSIONS

The linguistic philosophy of social networks has ancient roots, particularly, in the field of religious philosophy. The analysis of social networks through the prism of the concepts of Bernard Lonergan, a Canadian Catholic theologian and philosopher, and the Ukrainian orthodox school of the "philosophy of heart" proved their anthropological orientation and affinity in solving such issues as: dialogism as the basis of development of a person, society, and science; tolerance as

respect for the "difference" of others; "question" as an attribute of spirituality; love as the moral basis of anthropologization of God; person as a microcosm. Extrapolation of ideas of B. Lonergan and the school of the "philosophy of heart" in the sphere of discourse-analysis of social networks allowed to draw a conclusion about their systemic anthropocentric organization, and wide possibilities of religious philosophies in interpretation of discourses of social networks.

References

Advocacy, Protection and Legal Assistance to the Internally Displaced Population of Ukraine: project. <http://vpl.com.ua/uk/about-us-uk> [accessed on 2020. 02. 02].

Chyzhevskyi Dmytro. 1992. – Чижевський Дмитро. 1992. *Нариси з історії філософії на Україні* [Outlines of a History of Philosophy in Ukraine]. Київ: Видавництво Орій при УКСП Кобза. <http://litopys.org.ua/chyph/chyph.htm> [accessed on 2020. 02. 02].

Dictionary of the Old Ukrainian Language of the XIV–XV Centuries. 1978. – Словник староукраїнської мови XIV–XV ст. 1978. Hrynchyshyn D., Humetska L., Kernytskyi I. (Eds.) – Гринчишин Д., Гумецька Л., Керницький І. (уклад.). Київ: Наукова думка. Т. 2.

Darginavičienė Irena. 2018. The influence of culture and language on the identity of a person. *Logos*, 95: 164–176. https://doi.org/10.24101/logos.2018.37

Etymological Dictionary of the Ukrainian Language. – Етимологічний словник української мови: В 7 т. 2006. Melnychuk O. (Ed.) – Мельничук О. (Ред.). Київ: Наукова думка. Т. 5: Р–Т. <resource.history. org.ua/item/0007835> [accessed on 2020. 02. 02].

Fagerjord Anders, Storsul Tanja. 2007. Questioning Convergence. *Ambivalence towards Convergence: Digitalization and Media Change***.** Gothendurg: Nordicon. <https://www.duo.uio.no/bitstream/handle/ 10852/37257/ Ambivalence%20Fagerjord%20%26%20Storsul.pdf?sequence=1> [accessed on 2020. 02. 02].

Fogg B. J. 1997. Persuasive Computers: Perspectives and Research Directions. *Extended Abstract-s of CH1'97*. New York: ACM Press: 225-232. https://doi.org/10.1145/1120212.1120419.

Habermas Juergen. 1970. *Towards a Rational Society.* Boston: Beacon Press. <https://www.researchgate.net/ publication/304729388_Towards_a_Rational_Society> [accessed on 2020. 02. 02].

HISTORIANS.IN.UA: Facebook-group. <https://www.facebook.com/groups/326845994002408> [accessed on 2020. 02. 02].

Ignotaitė Indrė. 2018. Interneto anglų kalbos įtaka keičiant interneto lietuvių kalbos kultūrą [The Influence of Internet English on the Language Culture of Internet Lithuanian]. *Logos* 97: 175–189. https://doi.org/10.24101/logos.2018.80.

Ionas Hans. 2004. – Йонас Ганс. 2004. *Принцип ответственности: Опыт этики для технологической цивилизации* [The Imperative of Responsibility: In Search of Ethics for the Technological Age]. Москва: Айрис пресс Йонас.

Kompantseva Larisa. 2006. – Компанцева Лариса. 2006. *Философия Сети Интернет: школа Бернарда Лонергана и славянский опыт*: монография [Discourse Analysis as Theory and Method]. *Луганск: Знание.

Korolyov Igor. 2020. Discursive Practices as Sign Constructs of Communicative Consciousness. *Logos*, 102: 61–69. https://doi.org/10.24101/logos.2020.07

Krymskyi Serhii. 2003. – Кримський Сергій. 2003. *Запити філософських смислів* [Request for Philosophical Senses]. Київ: ПАРАПАН.

Lonergan Bernard J.F. 1941. St. Thomas' Thought on Gratia Operans. *Theological Studies*. № 2: 289–324.

Lonergan Bernard J.F. 1963. *Insight. A Study of Human Understanding*. London: Logman, Creen and Co LTD.

Lonergan Bernard J.F. 1974. Theology in Its New Context. *A Second Collection*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press: 55–68.

Lonergan Bernard J.F.1979. *Method in Theology*. USA: The Seabury Press, 1979.

Lonergan Bernard J.F. 1988. The Natural Desire to See God. *Collection, Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press. Vol. 4: 81–91.

Lonergan Bernard J.F.2000. Understanding and Being. *The Halifax Lectures on Insight.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press. Vol.5.

Lonergan Bernard J.F. 2005a. Philosophy of God, and the Theology. *Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan.: Philosophical and theological papers, 1965–1980*. Canada: University of Toronto Press. – Vol.17:162–192.

Lonergan Bernard J.F. 2005b. *Philosophical and Theological Papers, 1965—1980.* Canada: University of Toronto Press, 2005. Vol.17: 85–86.

Message of His Holiness Pope Benedict XVI for the 45th World Communications day. 2011. *Truth, Proclamation and Authenticity of Life in the Digital Age*. 2011. – Послання його Святості Папи Бенедикта XVI на 45-й Всесвітній день суспільних комунікацій. 2011. *Істина, звіщення та автентичність життя в цифровій епос* <https://risu.org.ua/ua/index/ projects/masmedia/40396> [accessed on 2020. 02. 02].

Oxford English Dictionary Online.2019. <https://www.eifl.net/e-resources/oxford-english-dictionary-online> [accessed on 2020. 02. 02].

Potebnia Aleksandr. 1976. – Потебня Александр. 1976. *Эстетика и поэтика* [Esthetics and Poetics]. Москва: Искусство.

Rheingold Howard. 2000. The Virtual Community: Homesteading on the Electronic Frontier. Cambridge; MIT Press, <https://books.google.com.ua/books?id=fr8bdUDisqAC&printsec=frontcover&hl=ru#v=onepage &q=f=false> [accessed on 2020.02.02].

Shad Ioan B. 1807. – Шад Иоан Б. 1807. *О верховной цели человека. Речи, говоренные в торжественном собрании Императорского Харьковского университета, бывшем 30 августа, 1806 года* [On the Higher Cause of Man. The Speeches Delivered at the Solemn Assembly of Kharkov Emperor University on the 30th of August 1806]. Харьков: Типография Харькоского университета: 34–47. <http://escriptorium.univer.kharkov.ua/ handle/1237075002/116> [accessed on 2020. 02. 02].

Skovoroda Hryhorii. 1994. – Сковорода Григорій. 1994. *Твори: У 2 т.* [Works: in 2 Vol.]. Київ: Обереги. <https://platona.net/load/knigi_po_filoso-fii/istorija_ukrainskaja/skovoroda-tvori-2-to-makh-1994> [accessed on 2020.02.02].

Snytko Olena. 2020. Image in Thought Encoding and Explication Processes. *Logos*, 102: 44–52. https://doi.org/10.24101/logos.2020.05

Stančienė Dalia Marija. 2011. Humanitarinių moks-lų studijos: Realybė ir lūkesčiai [The Studies of Humanitarian Sciences: Reality and Expecta-tions]. *Logos*, 68:183–194.

Toronto TV. – *Телебачення Торонто*. <https://www.facebook.com/michael.shchur> [accessed on 2020. 02. 02].

Weedon J., Nuland W. 2017. Information Opera-tions and Facebook. <https://fbnewsroomus.files. wordpress. com/2017/04/facebook-and-information-operations-v1.pdf> [accessed on 2020. 02. 02].

Wellman Barry. 2001. Physical Place and Cyber-place: the Rise of Networked individualism. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Re-search*. Vol.25 (2): 227–252. doi:10.1111/1468-2427.00309

Yurkevych Pamfyl. 1869. – Юркевич Памфил. 1869. *Курс общей педагогики с приложениями* [The Course of General Pedagogy with Appendices]. Москва. <https://rusneb.ru/ catalog/ 000199_000009_003582840> [accessed on 2020. 02. 02].

Yurkevych Pamfyl. 1990a. – Юркевич Памфил. 1990a. *Из науки о человеческом духе* [From the Science of the Human Spirit. Philosophical Works]. *Философские произведения*. Москва: Правда. <http://booksonline.com.ua/ view.php?book=157502&page=4> [accessed on 2020. 02. 02].

Yurkevych Pamfyl. 1990b. – Юркевич Памфил. 1990b. *Мир с ближними как условие христи-анского общежития* [Peace with Neighbours as a Condition of Christian Co-Existence. Philo-sophical Works]. *Философские произведения.* Москва: Правда. <http://booksonline.com.ua/ view.php?book=157502&page=4> [accessed on 2020. 02. 02].